

William Barker
London
1794

inman
DISSERTATION

ON THE
Rise, Progress, Views, Strength, Interests
and Characters, &c.

Henry Boyer
OF THE
WHIGS and TORIES.

DISSERTATION

ON THE
BRITISH MUSEUM
Rise, Progress, and
and Character of the
and Character of the

OF THE
W H I G S and T O R I E S.

A
DISSERTATION

ON THE

Rise, Progress, Views, Strength, Interests
and Characters,

OF THE

Two PARTIES

OF THE

WHIGS and TORIES.

B O S T O N :

Printed for Joseph Greenleaf, and sold at his
Printing-Office, in HANOVER-STREET.
M,DCC,LXXIII.

DISSERTATION

ON THE

PROGRESS, VIEWS, STRENGTH, LIMITS
AND CHARACTER

OF THE



Two

OF THE

WHIGS AND TORIES

BY

JOHN RUSSELL, ESQ.
OF THE BARR, ESQ.
OF THE BARR, ESQ.



A
DISSERTATION

ON THE
Rise, Progress, Views, &c.

OF THE
WHIGS and TORIES.

THE government of *England* is of a particular kind, of which there is not the like at present in all the world. It is, however, the same which was formerly established in all the kingdoms of *Europe*, formed out of the ruins of the *Roman* empire. The present difference between *England*, and other states, in this respect, is owing to this, that the *English* have preserved the form of their government ever since their settling in *Great Britain*; whereas in other nations, it has been lost by degrees, or extremely altered. This government, which has so long subsisted in this island, appears, in some respects monarchial, in others republican; and yet, properly speaking, it is neither. It cannot be called purely monarchial, since the nobility and the people have a share in the legislative power jointly with the king, nor can the king impose any tax, without the people's consent. Neither is it republican, since there is a king, who exercises the sovereign authority, who disposes, as he

pleases, of all places and dignities ecclesiastical, civil, or military; and can make peace or war, without consulting his subjects. It would be therefore in vain to pretend to describe this government, by the usual names of monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy, which agree not with it. It is a mixed government, differing from, and yet composed of, all three. The prerogatives of the sovereign, and the privileges of the nobles and people, are so tempered together, that they mutually support one another. At the same time, each of the three powers, concerned in the legislature, may insuperably obstruct the attempts of one or both the others, to render themselves independent. In short, it is very near the same form of government, established by the Saxons in Germany, by the Franks in Gaul, by the Visigoths in Spain, by the Ostrogoths, and after them, by the Lombards in Italy. These northern nations introduced this government into the most southern parts of Europe, when they settled there, and founded new states upon the ruins of the Roman empire.

If, therefore, it be asked, How long this government has been in England? I shall not scruple to answer, ever since the Anglo-Saxons finished the conquest of that part of Great Britain, which their descendents possess to this day. It is true, a doubt may arise, whether the commons, in the time of the Anglo-Saxons, were part of the parliament; and I confess this point is hard to be determined. But, however, when England was divided into seven kingdoms, English and Saxon, each of these had its king and parliament. This last was called the *Wittena-Gemot*, or assembly of wise-men; and there was also the like for the common affairs of the whole *Heptarchy*. This same form of government subsisted, when the seven kingdoms were reduced to one and the same state. The *fields of mars* [March] or of *May* called since the states general in France, the cortes in Spain, and perhaps the diets of the German empire, are the remains of this ancient form of government

introduced by the northern nations, wherever they settled.

William, duke of *Normandy*, surnamed the *Bastard* or conqueror, having subdued *England* in 1066, became absolute, and established a despotic power, though, in all likelihood, he preserved the shadow of a parliament. To secure his conquest, he transplanted many *Normen*, *French*, *Breton*, and *Angevin* families, enriching them with the lands, of which he incessantly dispossessed the *English*. These transplanted families multiplied greatly in a short space, and became in the end so powerful, as to make head against their sovereigns, successors of the conqueror. At first, they gloried in their entire dependence upon the king, who had put them in possession of their lands. Their interest required, that they should support that power by which they held all their *English* possessions. But when they were once firmly settled, they began to dread, that the regal power, which had enriched them, might with the same ease strip them of their estates, if the king should so please. For this reason, they wished, the government restored to the same state, as in the times of the *Saxon* kings. This was the only means to avoid the inconveniences of an arbitrary power, (which might, in time to come, turn as much to their prejudice, as it had to their advantage) and to perpetuate the possessions of their lands. What at first was only a bare wish, soon rose into hope, and at last into right, by the methods I shall presently speak of. To explain this fully, a large detail of the *English* history would be necessary, and a particular enumeration of all the causes which have contributed to put the nobility, and afterwards the people, in possession of a right, which they did not enjoy, under the first *Norman* kings. But as this detail would lead me too far, I shall content myself with a short abridgment, concerning the subject in hand.

William the conqueror, in 1087, left the kingdom of *England* to his second son *William*, surnamed *Rufus*, in prejudice of *Robert* his eldest son who had only *Normandy*. *Robert* made some attempts to dispossess his brother of a crown, of which he believed himself unjustly deprived. But *Rufus* defeated them by his address engaging as well the *Normans* as the *English* in his interest, with promises of re-establishing the ancient government, and reviving the *Saxon* laws. He knew that both were passionately desirous of what he made them hope. By the *Normans*, I mean here the foreigners newly settled in *England*. This promise of *Rufus* was therefore the first foundation of their pretensions. I say the first, for the *Normans* had no right to demand of the king what he was pleased to promise them, and the conquered *English* had as little, to limit the power of their conquerors. It is true, the *English* might ground their pretensions upon some general promises made them by *William the conqueror*, when he received their first homages. But this prince never pretended that they should found a right on these promises. Accordingly, he always treated *England* as a conquered nation. However, *Rufus* kept his word with neither *Normans* nor *English*.

Upon his death *Henry I*, his younger brother ascended the throne in 1100, in prejudice of his eldest brother *Robert*, still alive. To secure his usurpation, he pursued the same course as his predecessor *Rufus*. He promised to restore the ancient government, and confirmed his promise by a charter in form, but executed it no better than his brother. However, the rights of the subject received strength from these promises, though ill performed.

Henry I dying, *Maud* his daughter, widow of the emperor *Henry V*, and wife to *Jeffery Plantagenet* earl of *Anjou*, ought to have mounted the throne; but in 1135 was defeated of her right by *Stephen* earl of *Boulogne*, son of the conqueror's eldest daughter. He bound himself more strongly than his two prede-

efforts to restore the *Saxon* laws, but in all appearance with as little intention to perform his engagements. At last, the great men, finding he sought pretences to evade his promises, harrassed him with a war which lasted the most part of his reign. In the beginning, they called into *England* the empress *Maud*, and her son *Henry* by the earl of *Anjou*; and the war ended in a treaty, which secured the crown to *Henry* after *Stephen's* demise though he had sons.

To *Stephen*, in 1154 succeeded *Henry II.* During his reign, and that of his eldest son *Richard I.*, there were no contests between the king and the barons, for so the great men of the kingdom were then called. But very considerable disputes arose in the reign of king *John*, surnamed *Lackland*, brother and successor of *Richard I.* An unhappy quarrel between this prince and the court of *Rome*, having forced him to do homage to Pope *Innocent III.* for his kingdom, and bind himself to pay him tribute; this dishonorable proceeding, added to many other causes, lost him the esteem and affection of his subjects. The barons improved so favourable a juncture, presented to him the charter of *Henry I.*, which had never been executed, and resolved to oblige him to confirm it. *John* at first rejected it with great haughtiness; but at last compelled by his own weakness, and the united opposition of almost all the barons, he was obliged to grant them a charter, much more ample and advantageous to the subject, than *Henry the first's*, and which was called *magna charta* or the charter of liberties. By this charter, drawn as the barons pleased, the king's power was so curbed, that it was in a manner reduced to the same state as under the *Saxon* kings before the conquest. This charter has been ever since the principal foundation of the rights of the subjects. I shall not here pretend to decide a question so much above my reach, whether this foundation is very solid. It will suffice briefly to remark, by what means a concession

seemingly so defective in it's origin, since it was evidently extorted, changed as I may say it's nature by the firmness of the *English*, and acquired an indisputable authority, though it might have been contested at first. To this end, we must see what passed afterwards with respect to this charter.

King *John* who had signed it, desiring to revoke it, drew upon himself fresh misfortunes, which lasted as long as he lived. The barons resolved to adhere to their charter, took at last a desperate course to call in to their assistance, *Lewis*, Son of *Philip Augustus*, king of *France*, and to put him in possession of all, or the greatest part of the kingdom. *John* died during the war, deprived by a foreign prince, or rather his own subjects, and left a son of ten years of age, little capable to maintain the quarrel. Some lords, who had remained faithful to the late king, appointed the earl of *Pembroke*, regent during the minority of the young prince, who was recognized by his few adherents by the name of *Henry III.* in 1216.

Shortly after the face of affairs was changed, by the prudent conduct of the regent, who seeing the barons bent to support their charter, promised positively, it should be confirmed and executed. Upon this assurance, they deserted prince *Lewis*, who was obliged to return to *France*.

Henry III. was no sooner out of his minority than he repealed *magna charta*, and thought of reigning uncontrouled. But as he had not a capacity equal to such an undertaking, his long reign of fifty six years was one continued scene of troubles on account of *magna charta*. He was frequently forced to confirm it, and as often broke all his oaths and engagements. At last, the barons took arms under the conduct of the earl of *Leicester*, son of the famous *Simon Montfort* general of the crusade against the *Albigenses*. The king had the misfortune to lose a battle, and to see himself, his brother the king of the *Romans*, and his son prince *Edward*, in the hands

f the earl of *Leicester*, who obliged them to swear, they would never oppose the execution of *magna charta*. The earl of *Leicester* governed some time in the name of the king his prisoner. It is pretended the commons were first received into parliament during his administration. But without staying to examine so difficult a question, I shall only observe, that at least it cannot be denied, that since the end of *Henry III*'s reign, the commons have ever enjoyed this privilege.

Prince *Edward*, son of *Henry III*, having happily made his escape from the earl of *Leicester*, gained a battle in which the earl was slain. This victory restored the king to his liberty, who used it not agreeable to the oath he had been obliged to take. But his reign and life ended a few years after his deliverance. Though the baron's party was very much humbled, yet *Edward I*. who in 1272 succeeded his father *Henry III*. confirmed *magna charta*. However some steps taken by him afterwards, discovered a design to revoke it; but the barons beginning to stir, he retracted, and confirmed it once more.

Edward II, his son, and successor in 1307, was deposed by the parliament, for intending to establish an absolute power contrary to *magna charta*.

Edward III, son and successor of this unfortunate prince in 1327, confirmed it ten times during the course of his reign, which the victories obtained by himself and his son the prince of *Wales*, over *France*, rendered extremely glorious.

Richard II, grandson and successor to *Edward III*. in 1377, was solemnly deposed, for having violated in many instances the privileges of the people, founded on *magna charta*.

Henry IV, who had used that pretence to dethrone *Richard II*. in 1399, and put himself in his place, made some attempts to diminish the privileges of the parliament; but did not carry very far the execution of this project.

Henry V, his son who succeeded him in 1413, maintained the parliament in all its rights, and left the privileges of his subjects untouched. His reign was one continued series of victories, and successes against *France*. He died in 1422.

From that time the government of *England* remained so well settled, and so firm upon its foundations, I mean, the prerogative of the king, and the privileges of the parliament, that for near two hundred years, not one king appears to have had any intention to shake it. The policy of the kings, turned wholly upon governing their parliaments by secret intrigues, without discovering any desire of altering the constitution. True it is, that some kings, as *Henry VIII*, did what they pleased, but without any prejudice to the privileges of parliament. On the contrary, by supporting the parliament in its rights, they had the address to make it subservient to their ends. This, by the way, is the best, and perhaps the only method for a king to render himself powerful and easy.

After so long a continuance of the same form of government, and so uninterrupted a possession of the privileges of *magna charta*, the *English* nation was so accustomed to it, that it seemed impossible to make any alteration without throwing the kingdom into confusion. Nay, it seemed there was no fear that any king should ever think of attempting so difficult a thing, at the hazard of his crown, as had been the case of some former kings. Notwithstanding all this, *James I*, successor to queen *Elizabeth* in 1603, failed not to take some steps in this dangerous course, and endeavour to diminish the privileges of parliament. It was by the pernicious counsels of the duke of *Buckingham*, his favorite, that he engaged in this design, which probably would have ended unfortunately for him, had not death surprised him before he had plainly discovered his intention. This duke of *Buckingham* ought to be considered as the first author of the troubles, which have so long infested *England*, and still do infest it to this day.

It was under *Charles I*, son and successor of *James* in 1623, that the project to render the king absolute, and independent of the laws, was vigorously pushed and advanced by all methods. The duke of *Buckingham*, favourite to *Charles I*, as he had been to his father inspired him with maxims directly contrary to the established government and thereby occasioned his ruin. The duke being assassinated, the design was pursued by *Charles*, which had been begun by the deceased favourite. He imagined, the nation might be governed without a parliament, or at least that parliaments were only to supply him with money. He had dissolved three in the four first years of his reign, and even signified his intention of calling no more. Twelve years passed without a parliament, during which the king levied taxes by the bare act of his will, upon his subjects, and by his conduct discovered a design to reign arbitrarily. Unhappily for him, he admitted to his person and council two men imbued with the same maxims, by whom he was pushed on to his ruin; namely, *William Laud* archbishop of *Canterbury*, and *Thomas Wentworth* earl of *Strafford*.

While this prince had no difficulties to struggle with from abroad, he enjoyed his usurped power with some tranquillity, but not without the open murmurings of the people. Mean time, no person dared to oppose so violent a torrent. At last, the archbishop of *Canterbury* advising him to finish the restoration of the *Scotch* hierarchy, and introduction of the *English* liturgy, he followed the pernicious advice, but could not execute his project without engaging in an open war in 1639, with his ancient kingdom of *Scotland*. He levied forces, and maintained them by taxes, which he himself had imposed. Money failing him after the first campaign he at last in *April* 1640, called a parliament which was dissolved in a few days, for the same reason as the three first, and the arbitrary impositions continued as before. But the king quickly perceived,

that the continuation of his power, depended upon the happy success of his arms. The people served him with regret. The lords on divers pretences withdrew from court. The validity of his orders, by virtue whereof his impositions were levied, were contested in town and country. In short, the king saw his subjects every where ready to desert him, on the first occasion.

This occasion presented itself sooner than he expected. His army having received a check, and the Scots surprised *Newcastle*, the king was forced to seek means to drive them out of *England*, whereas he had hoped to become absolute in *Scotland*. But instead of finding his *English* subjects ready to assist him, he saw them on the contrary rejoice at his disgrace, and considered it as a proper opportunity to recover their privileges. In this extremity, he assembled the peers at *York*, in order to advise with them upon what was to be done. Their unanimous opinion, was, that the only way to free himself from the present difficulties, was to call a parliament. He then perceived, that an interval of fifteen years was not capable to efface out of the minds of the *English*, the memory of their parliaments, which they looked upon as the strongest support of their liberties. Mean while, he was under a sort of necessity to follow the advice of the peers, in calling a parliament.

In the present disposition of the people to the king, such representatives were chosen, as were eminent for their ability, courage, and firm attachment to the privileges of the subject. The parliament being met, instead of thinking to drive the Scots out of the kingdom, as the king had hoped, believed they ought, before all things to secure the liberties of the nation, by setting bounds to the illegal authority, which the king had for fifteen years assumed. This resolution was no sooner discovered, than all the people adhered to the parliament. From that time the king was so destitute of friends, that he saw himself unable to resist the torrent. His only

refuge was, to comply with his parliament; and pass almost every bill presented to him to curb his authority. He hoped, by this condescension, to convince his subjects of his intention to return to the ancient course, from which he had been diverted by evil counsels, and perhaps he really designed it, but could gain no belief. On the contrary, it was thought, that mere necessity obliged him to measures so opposite to the former. So, mutual confidence, so necessary between the king and his people, being entirely lost, the parliament would no longer depend upon the sincerity of a prince, whom they believed they had just cause to distrust. They therefore incessantly laboured to secure the liberties of the subject from any future invasion. To this end, they were not satisfied with obtaining the king's consent to acts which reduced the royal power within its ancient limits, but also extorted his assent to laws, which considerably lessened the just prerogatives of the crown. The friends of the parliament scrupled not to affirm, that the subject could never be secure in his property, while the king had power to return to his former courses. Thus king *Charles*, who had hoped to carry the royal authority higher than any of his predecessors, saw himself, on the contrary, deprived of great part of his legal power. He even had the mortification to see himself forced, in *May*, 1641, to sign the earl of *Stafford's* sentence, who had acted nothing without his orders, or at least his approbation. The archbishop of *Canterbury* also, lost his head on the scaffold in 1644.

Had the parliament contented themselves with settling the government upon its ancient foundations, very probably, it would not afterwards have been easily shaken. But on such occasions it is difficult to keep a just medium. The leading members willing to screen themselves from the attempts of the royal power, almost entirely changed the ancient constitution, by stripping the crown of the best part

of it's prerogatives. It was no longer the king and parliament which governed the nation, but the parliament alone, or rather the house of commons, managed all affairs. The house of peers had scarce any other power, than that of an implicit assent to the bills offered to them, and the king was but a shadow of a sovereign. However, it was this very thing that procured him adherents, whom doubtless, he would never have had, if the balance had been kept even. Many thought it as strange that the parliament should, as I may say, govern without a king, as that the king should attempt to rule without a parliament. The constitution of the government, suffered equally by both usurpations. But that which brought the strongest accession to the king's party, was, that the parliament, to gain the Scots to their interest, were possessed with the project, of changing the episcopal government of the church, into presbyterian, which they accomplished with open force. Most of the *English* accustomed to see the church under the direction of bishops, could not bear this change without murmuring. But as these were not the strongest, because the parliament had the treasure, army, and places at their disposal, their only refuge was to unite with the king.

Then it was that two parties appeared in the kingdom, one for the king, and one for the parliament, with a sort of equality, which quickly made it thought, they would not long remain quiet, and without coming to arms. The king's adherents at first had the name of *cavaliers*, which was afterwards changed into that of *tories*. And those of the parliament, then called *roundheads*, have received the name of *whigs*. The origin of these two famous distinctions is this: At that time a sort of *Irish banditti*, or robbers, who kept in the mountains and isles formed by the vast bogs of that country, were called *tories*, and at present are known by the name of *rapparees*. As the king's enemies accused him of fa-

vouring the *Irish* rebellion, which broke out about that time, they gave his adherents the name of *tories*. These, on the other hand, to be even with their enemies, who were closely united with the *Scots*, called them *whigs*, a name of reproach used in *Scotland*. Hence it appears, that these two names are as ancient as the troubles, though they were not in vogue till many years after. I cannot precisely fix the time, but am of opinion, that cavalier and roundhead, continued till the restoration of *Charles II*, and then by degrees, were changed into tory and whig. These are the two parties which began to divide *England* in the time of *Charles I*, and which still divide it to this day. The *Roman* catholic called papists in *England*, joined, from the first, the king's party, which was more favourable to them than that of the parliament, and have always remained united with the tories.

What has been said, sufficiently shows, that the king's party was composed of two sorts of men, of which the one had principally in view the political interest of the king and the crown and the others that of the church of *England*. But they were all re-united in this point, that they found their mutual advantages in the king's prosperity, without which they could not hope to succeed in there respective designs. For this reason, they were considered but as one party under the same name of cavaliers or royalists. This mixture of two defferent views in the same party, subsists to this day and is not one of the least causes of that confusion of ideas which the word *Tory* occasions. To remove this ambiguity as much as is possible, I shall call the first, the *political* or *State* cavaliers, and the other the *ecclesiastical* or *church* cavaliers. Each of these two branches were again sub-divided. For among the political cavaliers there were some who following the maxims of the duke of *Buckingham*, Archbishop *Laud*, and the earl of *Strafford*,

wished to see the king invested with absolute power and able to destroy the privileges of the parliament. These may be called the rank cavaliers. Their number was small and little capable to support the king in his adversity though during his prosperity, they made a great noise. The other branch of the political cavaliers, were composed of men whom I shall call moderate. These desired indeed the restoration of royal authority, but according to the ancient constitution. The other cavaliers, whom I call ecclesiastical, were also subdivided into two branches, one of which was composed of rigid churchmen, who were against the least change in the discipline of the church of *England*. Those who composed the other branch were less scrupulous and obstinate, and may be called the low or moderate churchmen.

In opposition to the cavaliers or royalists, the roundheads, or parliamentarians, were divided into two principal branches, namely, the political and ecclesiastical. The first had principally in view, the maintenance of the rights of the people, and the second, the advancement of presbytery. Each of these branches was likewise subdivided into two, one wherof was composed of republicans, who aimed at undermining the regal power, and erecting a common-wealth; the other of the moderate roundheads, or parliamentarians, desired only to reduce the king to an incapacity of abusing his power by leaving him the possession of his just rights. This relates only to the political roundheads, or parliamentarians. As for the ecclesiastical they also formed two branches, of which the first was composed of the rigid presbyterians who would be contented with nothing less than the destruction of the *Hierarchy*; and the other, of the moderate presbyterians, who would have been satisfied with much less, and perhaps, with a bare toleration. It was absolutely necessary to premise thus much, in order to enable the reader to understand the se-

quel of this dissertation. I shall more largely speak of the views and interests of the different branches of the two parties, after I have finished the abridgment which their rise obliged me to interrupt.

Whilst the king was in a deplorable state, without money or friends, and reduced to bear every thing from the parliament, who had him as I may say, in their mercy, he beheld a ray of hope shine in the rise of the two parties, I have been speaking of. He thought immediately, that to soment the division could not but be advantageous to him, wherein he succeeded. He thereby saw himself at last in a condition to hope to do himself justice, by his arms, for the injuries of which he thought he had reason to complain. In this expectation he raised an army, and engaged in an open war against the parliament, who on their side had now taken all the necessary measures to resist him.

The particulars of this war are needless here, since the sad conclusion of it is still recent. It will suffice to say, that *Charles I.* was vanquished, and beheaded the 30th of *January 1648*. Thus the king himself, the duke of *Buckingham*, the earl of *Strafford*, archbishop *Laud*, authors of the project to render the king absolute, came all to a tragical end. If to these we add, the examples of *John*, *Henry III.* *Edward II.* *Richard II.* and lastly, of *James II.* who had all the same design, and all miscarried in the execution, it will be easy to see how difficult and dangerous it is for a king of *England*, to attempt to subvert so well cemented a government.

Oliver Cromwell, author of *Charles I.*'s death, remained master of the government. He durst not however assume the title of king; and if he had the address to render himself absolute, it was under the specious pretence of maintaining the nation's liberties. He is the single instance in *England*, of an usurper dying a natural death in his usurpation.

While the sovereign authority was in *Cromwell's* hands, the cavaliers were extremely humbled. But

they revived on the death of this formidable enemy. To give their adversaries no advantage against them, they put themselves under the conduct of those of their party, who were the most moderate, so that there seemed to be no more rank or rigid Tories. This policy was absolutely necessary, at a time, when the royal prerogative, and the rights of the church were not to be insisted on, as there were neither king nor bishops. At last, by a most surprizing revolution, assisted by the prudent conduct of general *Monk*, the *English* united to set *Charles II.* on the throne, son of the deceased king, and to restore the monarchy and the church to their former state.

Charles II. reigned peaceably at first. He was a prince who wanted neither wit nor penetration, but was indolent, and addicted to his pleasures. His intention was to live quietly, and avoid all disputes with his subjects. He was too weary of a long exile, during which he had often wanted common necessaries, to be willing to hazard the being again reduced to the same state. On the other hand, the *English* had time, and frequent occasion, to open their eyes, and discover, that by a pretended maintenance of their liberties, they had been drawn into servitude. For it may be affirmed, that *England* had never enjoyed less freedom, than under the government of the long parliament, and afterwards of *Oliver Cromwell*. However, *Charles II.* engaged himself by degrees, farther than he ever intended. This, doubtless, was owing either to his indolence, or too great condescension to his ministers, who were all cavaliers, whom, for the future, I shall call Tories, as I shall give the roundheads the name of Whigs, though I do not know exactly when these two names were at first used. The Tories therefore, who alone were in the king's confidence, were incessantly urging him to restore the monarchy and church to their ancient lustre. The court of *France*, for interests of their own, laboured to inspire him

with the same design. In a word, his ministers took great care to hinder the whigs from insinuating themselves into the king's favour.

The tory party had at their head the duke of York, the king's brother, a prince naturally impetuous and violent, who having embraced the Roman catholick religion in his exile, formed the project of establishing it in *England*. This project could not be executed, without first extending the royal power beyond the bounds prescribed by the law, that is to say, without resuming and pursuing the same design, wherein his father had unhappily miscarried. But the Duke, by reason of his impetuous temper, was very improper to conduct such an undertaking. He pursued it eagerly during his brother's reign, who had no legitimate issue, hoping that the work then begun, would be more easy to finish on his own accession to the throne.

To succeed in this design, he had no other way than to begin it with the utter ruin of the whigs, whose principles were directly contrary to the duke's designs, both with regard to the church and the state. It must be observed, that most of the whigs were then presbyterians. So, in pretending only to attack presbyterianism, the duke of York projected the destruction of those who opposed the increase of regal power, without alarming the nation. Indeed after humbling the whigs, he might fear to meet with great obstacles from the moderate tories, whose principles did not entirely agree with the arbitrary power he intended to establish. But he despaired not to surmount, if the whigs, his more dangerous enemies, were once removed out of the way. To this end, he induced his brother to persecute the presbyterians, wherein he was assisted by all the tories, who with pleasure beheld this first occasion of being revenged on their enemies, the whigs. So presbyterianism was furiously attacked, under a pretence of restoring the church to the state it was in before the troubles. An act was passed, forbid-

ding the presbyterian assemblies, which were called *conventicles*; and another known by the name of the *test-act*, which indeed more directly concerned the *Roman catholics*. This act ordained, that no person should be admitted to any public office, without producing a certificate of his having communicated in an episcopal church. Moreover, it was called the conformity act, because all who were to be admitted to any office, were obliged by this statute to conform to the church of *England*.

The whigs soon perceived, that under colour of maintaining the rights of the church of *England*, the duke of *York's* design was to change the government of the state, and ruin the protestant religion in *England*. It required some time to take just measures; and at last, with the assistance of the moderate tories, who feared the duke of *York's* going too far, they obliged the king to send him out of the kingdom. Nay, the commons prepared a bill, called the *exclusion bill*, to deprive him of the right of succession. But the passing this bill was prevented by the dissolution of the parliament. Another was called at *Oxford*, in expectation of finding the members less violent. But the king was mistaken, and, after a short session, was again obliged to dissolve them, upon their endeavouring to pass the like bill.

It will perhaps seem strange, that the scene should be thus changed, and the whigs who were extremely low, should suddenly become superior. To let the reader into the reason of this change, it is necessary to remark, that the moderate tories promoted the designs of the court, while they believed them levelled only against the presbyterians. But perceiving by all the proceedings of the king, the duke of *York*, and the ministers, that a project was formed to ruin the constitution of church and state, and undermine the foundations of *magna charta*, they readily joined with the whigs to oppose the execution of this project. It was therefore this union

which gave the whigs a superiority, to which, otherwise, they never could have pretended. On the other hand, the state-tories and rigid churchmen, desiring to recover the ground they had lost, endeavoured to gain the people to their interest, by accusing the whigs of a settled design to ruin the church, and these in their turn accused the others, of intending the subversion of the government, and of favouring the duke of York's pernicious design. Thus the enmity of the parties, which seemed to have been much weakened by the restoration, was revived. It may truly be said, that the tories were in fault, who, to revenge the wrongs received from the long parliament, and *Cromwell's* usurpation, rashly threw themselves into the duke of York's party. They afterwards repented, when they saw to what the duke intended to make them subservient.

Some time after, the minds of the people being a little calmed, the duke of York returned into *England*, and continued without interruption to foment divisions, without which he could not hope to effect his designs. So this prince (by an excess of zeal for his religion, by a desire of revenge, and perhaps excited by the ambition of accomplishing a project, which had been in vain attempted by several kings of *England*) and *Charles II.*, through a too great condescension to his brother, kindled a flame in *England*, which is not yet extinguished.

Charles II., died during these transactions, and the duke of York ascended the throne, by the name of *James II.*, without any opposition. He at first made great promises to his subjects, that neither religion, nor the constitution, should suffer any change in his reign. But he was far from performing his promises. Shortly after, the duke of *Monmouth*, natural son of *Charles II.* relying on the discontent of the people, left the *low countries*, where he had lived some time in exile, made a descent in *England* with a handful of men, and assumed the title of king. But his royalty lasted but a few days. His party be-

ing much weaker than he had expected, he was defeated, taken, and beheaded. The king was so elated by a victory, obtained with such ease, that he scrupled not to discover his designs, so secure did he think himself of the success. The judges, who were devoted to him, gave their opinion, that the king might dispense with the laws. Their decision was founded upon some statutes lodging this power in the sovereign, with regard to certain laws; and upon examples of some of his predecessors, who had, in this respect, exceeded the bounds of their power. Thus these corrupted judges drew from particular cases a general conclusion, and founded a permanent right upon some transient usurpations.

This door being opened, the king, by his sole authority repealed the penal laws, enacted by several parliaments to prevent the designs of the papists. He next filled his army with officers of that religion, and bestowed preferments and titles upon men, who by the laws were unqualified. He took away the charters from *London*, and other corporations, and reduced them to a dependance upon his pleasure. In short, by a bare proclamation he granted a full liberty of conscience, and permitted to each sect the public profession of their religion. This proclamation had a double view, to favour the papists, and to amuse the presbyterians. The king was persuaded, that as the latter were still liable to the penal laws enacted against them in the late reign, they would be glad to be freed from them, and that the fear of forfeiting the liberty granted by the proclamation would keep them in submission. But they were not deceived by an artifice directly tending to their ruin. I omit many other steps taken by the king, which were but too capable to fill all his subjects with terror.

Hitherto the tories in general had favoured the king's designs. But when they perceived all his proceedings tended to a subversion of the established

government, and ruin of the protestant religion, they began to repent of their past conduct. They clearly saw, that by the course they were made to take, it was intended to lead them where they designed not to go, and that they could not attain their end, the ruin of the whigs, without the loss of their religion and liberty. In this danger, which could not be more imminent, they joined the whigs, and with them resolved to call in the prince of *Orange* to free them from their dangerous state. From that time the king's party became extremely weak, being composed of only papist's, rank tories, and some lords, slaves of the court, and their fortune. Mean while, the king appeared outwardly as powerful as ever, and near the end of his undertaking; because those who yet seemed attached to the court, did not think proper to declare before the time. The prince of *Orange* was landed before the king's weakness was visible. His army, his fleets, the lords whom he thought most devoted to his person, forsook him at once, and he was reduced, to the sad necessity of trying, in a disguise to escape out of his kingdom. But failing even in this attempt, he had the mortification to see himself at the mercy of the prince of *Orange*, and, in all appearance, indebted to his generosity, or perhaps his policy, for the indirect means which were furnished him, of flying into *France*. This example shows, that though the *English* are divided into two parties, and there is great enmity between them, their passion does not however cause them, in general at least, to abandon the interests of religion and liberty.

William and *Mary* being crowned, on the flight or, as it was called, the abdication of king *James*, their chief care was to stifle the seeds of division still subsisting between the whigs and tories, though the danger had united them. In order to this, it was necessary to remove from the ministry and

their confidence, the favourers of king *James's* designs, and the bigots to the minutest rites and ceremonies of the church of *England*. Without this, the whigs could never have enjoyed any quiet, since they ever considered the rank and rigid tories, as their irreconcilable enemies. On the other hand, it was not less necessary to remove from the council the most rigid whig presbyterians, for fear of giving occasion to think, there was a design to change the church-government. This fear would have been the more just, as the new king having ever professed in *Holland* the presbyterian religion, the least step in it's favour, might have raised a suspicion of his designing to establish it upon the ruins of the national church. Great address was therefore to be used to remove all causes of fear and jealousy in the tories. It was for these purposes, that during the reign of *William* and *Mary*, the offices were generally conferred on the moderate men of both parties. This maxim was pursued by king *William* when he reigned alone, after the queen's death. But as it was impossible to please both parties at once, unless there had been more places to give, he affected frequently to change his ministry and employ the two parties alternately. This was all he could do, till time should have extinguished entirely the flames of division.

Under such circumstances, and a king of such wisdom and foresight, it may be almost affirmed, that no disturbance would have happened to the government from the difference of the principles of the two parties, if the church-tories could have been contented with seeing their church remain established. But they could not be satisfied, so long as they saw the presbyterians enjoy an entire liberty of conscience, publicly exercise their religion, and fill offices, contrary to the conformity act of *Charles II.* They were jealous that the whigs intended by degrees to undermine the church, and that the king concurred with them in that design.

What they had seen during the long parliament gave them occasion to fear the same attacks. The rank tories having lost king *James*, their patron and defender, inspired the episcopal party with these fears and jealousies, to animate them against king *William*. They perceived, they were no longer able to support themselves, unless means were found to engage the church in their quarrel. Hence the rumors industriously spread among the people, of the church's being in danger. The whigs saw by this, that the rank tories had not relinquished their projects, but would, when ever they were armed with power, make use of the pretence of religion to ruin them, in imitation of king *James*. It was thus, that animosity was continued between the two parties, notwithstanding king *William's* care and endeavors.

It seemed therefore, that religion was then the sole point in question between the two parties; the junctures not allowing either the rank tories, or the republican whigs, to push their principles. This has given occasion to a false idea of the differences between the two parties, and to an imagination, that they solely consist in a diversity of sentiments concerning church government. But this is certainly a mistake. When an opportunity offers, the rank tories show, that the safety of the church is not the sole motive of their conduct, and probably the republican-whigs would also remember their maxims, at a favorable juncture.

As to the papists, who may be considered as a branch of the tories, they have had reason to be satisfied with king *William's* moderation, if their extreme desire to see king *James* again on the throne, had not caused them to look upon the reigning king as their enemy. Some of them were even engaged in conspiracies against his person, which only turned to their own confusion and ruin. This immoderate desire expressed by the papists, and even by some tories, for the restoration of king *James*, obliged king *William* to seek means, not only for the pre-

vention of their ill designs during his life, but also to render their endeavours fruitless after his death. Accordingly, by an act of parliament the succession of the crown was settled in the illustrious house of *Hanover*, without any regard to the pretensions which birth or nearness of blood could give to any papist whatsoever. *William* died shortly after, and *Anne*, daughter of *James II*, and princess of *Denmark*, mounted the throne.

This queen had been educated in the principles of the rigid tories with respect to religion, and probably in those of the rank tories, with regard to government. At least all who had any power over her, or were concerned in her education, were of this character. *Charles II*, her uncle, *James II*, her father, the earl of *Rocheſter*, her mother's brother, were all rank tories, deeming any opposition to the sovereign's will, a manifest rebellion. Queen *Anne* was besides of no great capacity, and naturally obstinate. An accidental quarrel with her sister queen *Mary*, having made her resolve to withdraw from court, she was so punctual to her resolution, that she would not even visit the queen her sister, when on her death-bed. The meanness of her genius foretold the power which her ministry would have in the government. On the other hand, her education made it feared, she would be guided by the rank and rigid tories, of whom her uncle the earl of *Rocheſter*, was considered as the head. This lord was equally dreaded by the whigs and moderate tories, as a dangerous man, and capable of carrying things to extremities. He was otherwise a person of great parts, but very fond of his principles. Probably he was going to be at the helm of the government, by the accession of the queen his niece to the throne. But it is pretended that the fear of the moderate tories to see him in so high a post, made them resolve to join with the whigs, to prevent it. At least it is certain, that such an union was made, which forced the queen to throw

herself into their arms, and trust them with the management of affairs. I am a stranger to the intrigues used to bring the queen to these measures. The lords, *Godolphin, Marlborough*, and some other leaders of the moderate tories, were among those who joined the whigs, and strengthened them more by their ability, than their credit and numbers, from this time, the moderate tories and the whigs made but one party.

It is needless to relate here, with what glory to *England*, and to the queen in particular, these new ministers directed the public affairs. This is a thing universally known, and the memory of it is still recent. But it is presented, that by reason of the meanness of the queen's genius, they held her in a kind of servitude, though they outwardly affected to give her the honor of all her glorious successes. During their administration, the rank and rigid church-tories were excluded from all civil employments, and ecclesiastical dignities. Had this continued to the death of the queen, these two branches of the tory party would doubtless have been considerably lessened in number and credit.

Mean time, the queen saw herself, not without some impatience, forced, as it were, to follow the counsels of those whom she had a right to command, and who, if public report is to be credited, left her not free to pursue her own inclinations or judgment. The rank tories perceiving, or perhaps suggesting these sentiments to the queen, industriously cherished her discontent, by the assistance of a certain lady, who was in her confidence. Such was their success, that after they had satisfied her, that she was a slave, they brought her to a resolution of freeing herself. This intrigue was conducted with such art and secrecy, that her ministers found themselves supplanted, before any measures could be taken to prevent their ruin. Immediately their places were filled with rank and furious tories. The parliament, in which the whigs had a great supe-

majority of votes, was dissolved, and another called, to which the new ministers took care to have members returned devoted to their party. Any person, ever so little acquainted with the affairs of *England*, knows what influence the court has in the elections. It may, however, be affirmed, that in respect of number, the party of the ministry was still inconsiderable. But they had the queen and the parliament on their side. Besides, they were very careful to strengthen their party, by infusing jealousies on the account of religion, and persuading the episcopalians that the church had been in great danger, during the late administration, and would always be so, as long as the whigs had any share in the government. These insinuations revived the passion of the church-tories, and carried them to such excesses against the presbyterians, as should not be allowed in a well ordered state, but which these ministers affected to connive at. Indeed, their design was not to lessen, but rather to increase the animosity between the two parties, because their own was thereby strengthened.

Hitherto every thing succeeded to the wish of the new ministry. But they were very sensible, that the present advantages procured by these imaginary terrors would be of no long continuance. Besides, though they could have kept the people always in this disposition, the queen might die very soon, especially as she was very infirm. In that case, they had reason to fear, the fabrick they had raised, would be demolished, by the elector of *Hanover*, who was to succeed the queen, by virtue of the act of succession, for which he was chiefly indebted to the whigs. They were therefore to think of preventing this danger without loss of time. Their party was too weak to struggle with the sovereign, should he happen to be against them, as had been often seen during the reign of king *William*, and in the first years of queen *Anne*. They therefore concluded, at least, if we may judge

by their proceedings, that their surest way would be to secure the crown to the pretender, in order to have a protector when the queen should fail them. It is however still uncertain, whether the earl of *Oxford*, that able minister, now in the tower, was of this opinion. But it cannot be denied, that they believed the assistance of *France* to be absolutely necessary for their support. Accordingly, to secure it, they made a dishonourable and hasty peace to the astonishment of all *Europe*, and forced the allies of *England* to follow her example. Probably, had not the queen died so soon after the peace, the oppressed whigs would have been obliged to call in to their assistance, the elector of *Hanover*, as they had before the prince of *Orange*, but with far less hope of having the general concurrence of the people. The reason is, because king *James's* design to subvert the church and state, was so open, that it could not be doubted, whereas against the pretender there were only bare presumptions.

What has lately happened since king *George's* accession to the throne, shows there was a formed design to secure the succession to the pretender, and had not the death of the queen happened, before the authors of it had time to take all their measure. It is however uncertain, whether they could have executed their design, or whether, if they could, the pretender's reign would have been of any long continuance. The *English* in general are extremely jealous of their laws and liberties, nor are they less so of their religion. This is what I think I may venture to affirm, though some of them seem indifferent as to the latter. But, thanks be to God, these are far from being the majority. Now it would have been very difficult for the pretender, advanced to the throne by foreign aid, professing a religion contrary to the national, and guided by rank Tories, to keep himself within the bounds of moderation, necessary to gain the hearts of his subjects, without which a king of *England* can never sit

firmly on his throne. However, without staying to guess what might have happened, let us only observe that the rank and rigid tories have been disappointed. Not only, the pretender is not king, but his hopes of becoming so were never less. King *George* is in peaceable possession of his crown; the tories are humbled, and the whigs, lately oppressed, are now at the top of the wheel.

After this brief account of the rise and progress of the tories and whigs, it will not perhaps be unacceptable to the reader to know more particularly the views, interests, strength and characters of the two parties. For this purpose the different branches before mentioned must be carefully distinguished. It is therefore necessary to repeat here that the two parties, may be considered under two different relations; namely, with respect to the state, and with regard to the church. I shall first speak of the state: tories and whigs, after which, I shall consider them with respect to religion.

The state-tories are, as I said, divided into two branches, one of which may, in *French*, be called *rank*. In *England* they are known by the name of high-flyers. This idea, taken from birds, that by soaring above the common flight, lose themselves in the clouds, is very suitable to men, who cannot contain themselves within the limits of the established government. These are for having the sovereign absolute in *England*, as he is in *France*, and some other countries, and for erecting his will into law. They regard not what I have said in the beginning of this dissertation, that all the governments at this day in *Europe* were originally like that established in *England*; and consequently there is no reason why the *English* should imitate nations who have suffered it to be lost, or at least very much altered. It may be imagined that in such a country as *England*, this party cannot be very numerous, and yet they are very considerable for three reasons. First, because the heads of this party are persons of the high-

est rank, and commonly favorites and ministers of state, or such as hold the greatest offices at court, and the most eminent dignities in the church. These men who would not willingly put themselves under the conduct of others, being thus advantageously situated, become, generally, the leaders of all the tory-party. They manage them as they please, not only for the advantage of the whole party, but chiefly for their own particular ends. Thus, very often, under pretence of acting for the interest of the party, their proceedings tend only to their own advantage, and the tories are led by them much farther than most of them desire. It is this which gives occasion to many persons to accuse all the tories of being for arbitrary power, though it is certain that only the high-flyers are chargeable with this principle. But it is no great fault, it seems, to ascribe to a whole party what is done by their leaders.

Secondly, This particular branch of tories is considerable, in that, when they are in the ministry, they engage the church-tories strenuously to maintain the doctrine of passive-obedience, which goes a great way towards gaining the people to their party. They insinuate to the episcopal ministers, that they have only in view the ruin of the presbyterians, and under that pretence cause them to preach a doctrine, the consequence of which extends to all the subjects. This was experienced in the reigns of *Charles II*, of *James II*, and of queen *Ann*, towards the conclusion.

Lastly, The party of the high-flyers becomes very powerful, when as it frequently happens, they are supported by the king, and then it is that the liberty of the nation is in danger. Proofs of this, have been seen in the reigns of *James II*, *Charles I*, *Richard II*, *Edward II*, and *Henry III*; for the high-flyers are more ancient than is imagined.

E

The second branch of the state-tories is composed of those I called moderate. These are for having the king enjoy all his prerogatives, but they pretend not, with the high-flyers, to sacrifice to him the privileges of the subject. They are true *Englishmen*, who have the welfare of their country at heart, and are for preserving the constitution transmitted to them by their ancestors. They have often saved the state, and will again save it, when in danger, from the rank tories or republican whigs, by opposing with all their power those who shall attempt to alter the government. It would be injustice, to confound them with the high-flyers under the general denomination of tories.

As there are two branches of state-tories, so there are two of state-whigs, namely, republican, and moderate whigs. The republican whigs are the remains of the party of the long parliament which endeavored to turn the government into a commonwealth. These at present are so inconsiderable that they serve only to strengthen the other whigs with whom they usually join. The tories would persuade the public, that all whigs are of this kind. And in like manner, the whigs would have it believed that all tories are high-flyers. But this is only an artifice to render one another mutually odious.

The second branch of the state whigs contains the moderate whigs, who are nearly allied to the moderate tories in principle; and consequently are to be considered as true *Englishmen*, who desire, the government may be maintained upon its ancient foundations. Herein they would be exactly like the moderate tories, were it not that these incline more to the king, and the moderate whigs, to the parliament. The moderate whig is perpetually hindering the people's rights from being invaded, and sometimes even takes precautions at the expence of the crown. By him the triennial act was procured, with some others, which it is need-

less to mention, to prevent the abuse of the royal power. Hence it is evident that the high-flyers have no greater enemy than the moderate whig, and that these two branches of whigs and tories properly form the opposition between the state-tories and state-whigs. These last laugh at passive-obedience when it's consequences are carried too far. Their principal is, that the royal power has it's bounds, which cannot be transgressed, without injustice. Consequently they believe, that whenever the sovereign exceeds his prerogative, he may be resisted by his subjects. Hence it is easy to infer, they do not think the king can dispense with the laws.

What has been said is sufficient to show that the moderate state-whigs and tories are almost of the same sentiments. Their being of different parties proceeds from their mutual fear that either may make the ballance incline too much to the king's or parliament's side. It is not therefore strange, that these two branches of the opposite parties, unite in the pressing exigencies of the state. For, their views equally point to the preservation of the government; though often they pursue their end by different paths. Accordingly since the union of these two branches upon the death of king *William*, they have remained inseparable, and the moderate whig and tory form almost the same party, under the common appellation of whig. I dare not however affirm that there are not yet moderate tories who keep by themselves, and are unwilling to be confounded with the whigs.

It must be remembered that hitherto I have only spoke of the tories and whigs in relation to the government, without any regard to religion. I take care not to confound things which ought to be carefully distinguished. It is not true that all church-men are tories, or all presbyterians, whigs in point of government, as is commonly imagined. Many presbyterians are in this respect of the same

principles with the moderate tories, and would not be less concerned to see the king stripped of his prerogatives, than the subject of his privileges. In like manner many church-men, even bishops themselves, are whigs, very good whigs as to the government, and as considered in opposition, to the high-flyers, which show the necessity of distinguishing state-tories and whigs, from church-whigs and tories, of whom we are now going to speak.

I presume the reader knows that the church of *England*, when she received the reformation, admitted only some alterations in her doctrine, but preserved the hierarchy with all the ceremonies in which she saw nothing superstitious. The reformation was not properly compleated till the reign of *Elizabeth*. Then it was that several constitutions of the convocation, confirmed by acts of parliament, settled the public worship as it stands to this day. Mean while, many *Englishmen* who had fled from the rage of queen *Mary*, returned home with favorable sentiments of the reformation, as established in *France*, *Switzerland*, *Geneva*, and other parts of *Germany*. These men could not comply with the reformation in *England*, which, in their opinion, had not been carried far enough from the church of *Rome*. For this reason they not only absented themselves from the assemblies of the established church, but also composed separate assemblies, which were called conventicles. These separatists were likewise stiled presbyterians, because, refusing their submission to the bishops, they maintained that all priests or ministers had an equal authority in the church, which ought to be governed by presbyteries, or consistories, composed of *ministers* and *lay-elders*. Upon this occasion were two parties formed, who, wanting the mutual forbearance of persons, professing in the main the same religion, began to molest one another with disputes in conference and writing. The church-of-*England*-men were very angry, that private persons should pre-

tend to reform what, after minute deliberation, had been established by national synods and parliaments. On the other hand, the presbyterians thought it no less strange, that they would be compelled to practise what they believed contrary to the purity of religion, and with what their consciences could not comply. The presbyterians were long oppressed, because their adversaries supported their arguments with reasons from the authority of the queen and parliament.

The presbyterians conceived great hopes of the accession of *James I.* because that prince had always professed their religion whilst he reigned in *Scotland*. But as he readily conformed to the church of *England*, they were not much eased. Mean while, this party, though oppressed, so increased, that in the beginning of the troubles they were become very numerous. King *Charles I.* was so attached to the church of *England*, that it may be affirmed, he died a martyr to it, as is evident from his history. His opinion of the purity of this church, made him hearken to *William Laud* archbishop of *Canterbury*, suggesting to him the reduction of the church of *Scotland* under the same government with that of *England*, by introducing the hierarchy. This undertaking engaged him in a war with *Scotland*, and the war produced the long parliament, against which he thought himself obliged to take arms. This parliament wanting the assistance of the *Scots*, could not obtain it but by an engagement to make the church of *England* presbyterian. A quarrel was therefore sought with the bishops, deans and chapters, in a word, with the whole church of *England*, which saw it's hierarchy, established by queen *Elizabeth*, entirely subverted, and the *Scotch* presbyterian government introduced. In this distress the episcopalians had no other resource than to unite the episcopal party with the king's party, and as they had one common interest with the cavaliers, namely, the maintenance of the king's cause, they were

confounded with them under the same party denomination. The presbyterians were in the like manner reckoned among the roundheads, because they adhered to the parliament.

During the long parliament, and even to the death of *Cromwell*, the division of the branches just mentioned, was hardly perceived. All who were known by the name of roundheads, or parliamentarians, were rigid presbyterians and republicans. This was the party then in vogue, and the only one that could prefer such as aspired to the posts in the gift of the parliament. In like manner the followers of the king's party appeared to be rank cavaliers, or rigid episcopalians, because these were then most regarded at court. But on the restoration of *Charles II.* the several branches of the two parties began to be distinguished. All being tired with the troubles which had so long harrassed the kingdom, the moderate no longer feared to discover their sentiments. Some of the presbyterians testified a readiness to relax, and many episcopalians were of opinion that, for the sake of peace, some condescension might be used to the presbyterians. These therefore were the men of both parties, who preserving this moderation, formed the two branches of the moderate whigs and tories, with respect to religion. But still the majority in both parties; firmly adhered to their principles with inconceivable obstinacy. Amongst the episcopalians there were, who, upon no account whatsoever, could be persuaded to recede in the least from the practise of their church. On the other hand, there were presbyterians who were no less offended at seeing a minister officiate in a surplice, than at hearing him preach heresy, and who branded with the name of idolatrous and superstitious, every ceremony retained by the church of *England*. This gave birth to the two branches of the rigid episcopalians and presbyterians, which subsist to this day. The hierarchy is the princi-

pal point, on which they are divided. They are both comprised under the name of whigs and tories, because the rigid episcopalians join with the tories, and the presbyterians with the whigs.

From what has been said concerning the several branches of whig and tory, it is easy to gather that these two names are very obscure and equivocal terms, because they convey, or ought to convey to the mind different ideas, according to the subject discoursed of. For instance, if I hear it said, that the tories and whigs are at great enmity, this raises in my mind an idea comprehending all the several branches of whigs and tories in general. But if I am told, the tories are for having the king absolute and independant, or that the whigs would be glad the regal power were abolished, my idea can only extend to the high-flyers and the republican-whigs. The rest of the whigs and tories would doubtless be offended at any such imputations. In like manner, if I hear that the tories had rather see a papist on the throne than a protestant, favorable to the whigs, I should injure the tories in general, by imputing such a thought to them, which can only be entertained by the popish and some rigid church-tories, and perhaps some high-flyers. Lastly, if I hear that the whigs aim at the ruin of the church of *England*, I can understand this only of the presbyterian whigs, since the episcopal whigs, amongst whom are several bishops, cannot of justice be accused of laboring the ruin of their own church. Thus the names of tories and whigs convey to the mind certain confused ideas, which few are capable of rightly distinguishing. But this difficulty still increases, when it is considered that the same person may be either whig or tory, according to the subject in hand. A presbyterian, for instance, who wishes the ruin of the church of *England*, is certainly for that reason in the whig-party. But if this presbyterian opposes with all his power, the attempt of some of his party, against the regal authority, it cannot be denied that he is in

that respect a true tory. In like manner, when the church only is concerned, the episcopal party are to be considered as tories. But how many even of these are whigs with respect to the government? Nor have foreigners only such confused ideas in this matter; the *English* themselves are liable to them. Nothing is more frequent than to hear a whig charging all the tories in general with an intention to destroy the rights and liberties of the subject; and a tory arraigning the whigs without distinction, as utter enemies to the church and state. Every man uses this confusion of ideas, occasioned by the names of whig and tory, to accuse his adversaries of what is most odious in both parties.

Having shown as distinctly as I could, what is to be understood by the tories and whigs, I am next to examine the several motives and interests of the two parties. Were we to rely on what is said by both, nothing is more just, more equitable, than the motives by which they are actuated, namely, the glory of God, the honor of the king, the public good and the welfare of the nation. For my part, if I may speak my mind, it is my belief, that as they are all men, interest is the main spring of all their actions. Since the two parties were formed, each has earnestly laboured to gain a superiority over the other, because this superiority is attended with posts, honors and dignities which are conferred on their own members by the prevailing, in exclusion of those of the contrary party. This made king *William* say, that, *If he had places enough to bestow he should soon reconcile the two parties.* There would be yet another expedient to supply what that prince imagined, namely, to confer all the great places upon neutral lords. But where shall we find a sufficient number of such, who are qualified to exercise the highest offices? Certainly there are but very few. I own however, there are some, who, by their capacity, their impartiality, their disinterestedness, would deserve a particular distinction.

I wish I knew them all, that I might insert their names, and give them in part their due praise. But these lords, so worthy of being known, are little heard of in foreign parts, because as they make their court to neither party, the public posts generally fall not to their share. Nevertheless, it sometimes happens that ministers are in a manner obliged to find out these neutral lords, and advance them to the first dignities in the kingdom. We know one especially, who without ever courting the whig or tory ministers, was sent ambassador and plenipotentiary at the peace of *Ryswick*, honored with the order of the garter, successively raised to the offices of lord privy-seal, lord president of the council, lord high-admiral of *England*, and lord-lieutenant of *Ireland*, though he never solicited these great offices. I speak of the earl of *Pembroke*, whose reputation is better known to me, than that of some other lords of the same character, who ought to receive no injury from my silence. Among all his other virtues, his integrity in the great posts which he has filled, calls for much nobler encomiums than he can receive from a foreigner, who has neither the honor to know him personally, nor to be known by him. If there were in *England* twelve such lords, advanced to the great offices, it would be an infallible means to humble both parties at once. Then the aspirers to employments would make it a merit to espouse neither party, and this impartiality would soon descend from the great men to the people. But this is a happiness rather to be desired than hoped. Neutrality, far from promoting persons of distinguished merit, is rather a sure impediment to their rising, because the ministers and party-leaders think only of gratifying their creatures.

Interest, as I said, is the principal motive which actuates the two parties, and this is but too apparent. If, for instance, the high-flyers wish to see

the sovereign in possession of absolute power, I very much doubt whether this flows from a desire of procuring the welfare of the kingdom, though they should be persuaded that despotism is the most compleat form of government. If the public good was the sole spring of their actions, they would not be so warm. The same may be said of the other branches of the two parties. Each would have it believed, they have only the good of the kingdom in view, while in fact they are only laboring for themselves, their family and posterity. But when I say that interest is their principal motive, I pretend not to exclude entirely many others, which may actuate as well the heads as the members of each party. Some believe that their principles really tend to the good of the state; others act from a religious motive; some are swayed by revenge, party-spirit, and the desire of superiority. Numberless other motives there are on which I think it needless to enlarge, that I may not be led to examine the conduct of particulars. It is certain, many may pursue the same end from different motives. It will be better to show the strength and several interests of both Parties. In order to this, it is necessary to proceed in this examination according to the different branches into which they are divided. I shall begin with the Tories.

It is difficult at first to conceive, that in a country like *England*, blessed with so many noble privileges which other nations do not at present enjoy, there should be men who wish to see the king invested with unlimited power. There are indeed but very few who openly profess themselves to be of the party which I call high-flyers. Nevertheless it is but too true that such a party has always been in *England*, and still subsists, to this day, though disowned by most of those who are engaged in it. Can it be denied that such a party existed under *Charles I*? The very judges of the kingdom, who are considered as the interpreters of the law, gave

it as their opinion, that in cases of necessity the king might impose taxes upon his subjects, and that the king himself is the sole judge of such cases. This was rooting up the noblest prerogative of the parliament, and the principal cause of their frequent meetings. If the sovereign could levy taxes upon his subjects, without authority of parliament, it may be affirmed, that their sessions would be very rare, and perhaps in time, entirely cease. But if the parliament were once laid aside, what would become of the privileges and immunities of the subject? In all likelihood the case would be the same as in *France*, since the general assembly of the states has been discontinued. Has it not also been seen under *James II*, that the judges, ascribed to the king a power of dispensing with the penal laws? And was not this making him absolute? In short, we have seen *Charles I*, *Charles II*, *James II*, taking large steps toward arbitrary power which they would never have attempted, had they not expected to be supported by a numerous party. Let queen *Anne*'s proceedings in the last years of her reign be considered; for instance, the negotiation and conclusion of the peace of *Utrecht*, the creation of twelve peers at once, the violences used in parliamentary-elections, and, it cannot be denied that they were so many advances towards despotism, to which she was excited by the party I am speaking of. It is therefore certain, there is such a party in the kingdom. But as they dare not openly avow their principles, they cover them with the pretence of maintaining the rights of the crown, to which they seem to confine themselves, willing to have it believed that they are of the party of the moderate tories. But the principal high-flyers, being commonly favorites or ministers of state, it generally happens that they become heads of the whole party of the tories, and ingage them to do more than they would. They begin with attacking the presbyterians, and so ingage the

church-tories, to follow their measures, without knowing whither it is intended to lead them. On pretence of having the dissenters only in view, they cause the clergy to preach passive-obedience, which tends directly to arbitrary-power. It is this which renders the high-flyers more powerful than appears at first sight. The main concern of them lies in drawing the church into their quarrel, by pretending an extreme zeal for her rights. They are thereby confounded with the church-tories, whose number is very considerable, avoid giving the alarm to the moderate tories, and keep themselves undiscovered till they have made the whole party subservient to their particular designs. But for all this, notwithstanding their care to observe what I have been saying, they have the misfortune never to arrive at the end of their career. After they have made themselves leaders of the whole tory-party, and by secret paths, conducted the moderate and church-tories to a certain point, they are at last forced upon some proceedings which discover their designs. Then they lose many of their followers, who not only desert them, but go over to the *Whigs*. This was the case of *James II*, who saw himself suddenly abandoned by all the world, just as he thought himself secure of his ends. If in the last year of queen *Anne*, the high-flyers who governed in her name, had attempted to procure a repeal of the act of succession, very probably, they would have met with the same mortification, and I do not doubt but the same thing will happen upon every the like occasion. The reason of what I advance seems to me evident, namely, that it can be advantageous but to very few *Englishmen*, to have a popish or absolute king.

The party or branch of the moderate tories much exceeds in number that of the high-flyers ; whatever advantage this last may have from the quality of their leaders, the other is more powerful from the goodness of their cause, I mean the pre-

fervation of the king's just prerogatives. This is properly the interest of all *Englishmen*, who cannot hope for greater happiness under any other form of government, than under that which has been so long established. This branch of the moderate tories becomes still more considerable as often as any attempt is made to extend or to abridge the royal prerogative. If to abridge it, they are joined by all the whigs; if to extend it, they are assisted by all the rest of the tories. Nevertheless, it sometimes happens, that the junctures produce some change in the principles, as well as in the interests of this party. When the sovereign favors the tories in general, by conferring places and posts upon them, nothing is capable to detach the moderate tories from his interest: But their affection cools whenever he inclines to the other side. Then, if they see the whigs, by a precaution common to them, make any attempt upon the prerogative royal, they are ready to join them. But herein their sole aim is to let the king know that they deserve his regard. This course was frequently taken by them in the reign of king *William*, who often changed sides. In general, it is the interest of the moderate tories to oppose the attempts of the whigs against the authority of the sovereign, because this supports their credit at court and in the country. But withal they are to take care that the high-flyers do not, under the specious pretence of being of the same name and party, carry them farther than is necessary.

As to the church-tories, it may easily be conceived that they include almost the whole kingdom in their party, since this branch consists of all the members of the church of *England*. Therefore when religion is in question, between the whigs and tories, the former are not able to resist their adversaries. To this superiority is owing the readiness with which the church-tories show their resentment against the presbyterian whigs. It is not

so with the whigs, who even in their greatest prosperity dare not so much as discover the least thought of attacking the church. They did it once under the long parliament, and it will never be forgot by the tories. They look upon the whig-party as an enemy always ready to undermine the foundations of their church, and, from what was once done, infer the desire of doing the like again, when a favorable opportunity presents. This makes them so readily receive every impression which from time to time is given them of the church's being in danger, and suffer themselves to be so easily deluded on that account. Their leaders know so well how to improve this disposition, that they project nothing in relation to the state, without including the church. This is an infallible expedient to unite the whole party, which would be very much divided, were the government only concerned. This procured *Charles I.* many adherents, whom assuredly he would have wanted, had the parliament not attacked the church of *England*. Moreover it was this, which in the reign of *Charles II.* put the duke of *York*, though a papist, at the head of the episcopal tories, who willingly concurred with him in the destruction of their enemies. Whenever king *William* turned to the side of the whigs, the tories were full of imaginary fears of his laboring the ruin of their church. The same method was practised in the first years of queen *Anne*, because the ministry was then composed of whigs or moderate tories. The same imaginary fear threw the episcopalians, towards the conclusion of that reign, into the schemes of men who had visible no religion at all. In short, on this very pretence, we lately saw in the reign of king *George*, a popish pretender called in to screen the church of *England* from the pretended attempts, she had to fear from the whigs. It is therefore religion which gives power to the tory-party. It is certain, if the secret of interesting the church in the quarrel was not practised, the high-flyers would make a very

contemptible figure, and the difference between the whigs and moderate tories would cause none of those disturbances in the kingdom, which have so long prevailed.

It is true that among the church-tories, there are many who are very sensible of the artifices by which the whole party is engaged in a quarrel, advantageous but to few. Of this number are those, I call low church-men, among whom some possess the first dignities of the church. But they are not the strongest. The party of the rigid church-men is much more numerous. This last branch consists of almost all the inferior clergy, of some bishops of both universities particularly that of *Oxford*, and these bodies draw after them a great number of the laity. It is these that compose what is called in *England*, high-church, that is, a church which has no mixture of presbyterianism. These men are so attached to the least ceremony of the church of *England*, that they would not relax upon any thing whatsoever, and by this stiffness, they discover more of the spirit of party, than of zeal for religion. I will even venture to say, that many of them would rather chuse to see *England* under popery than presbyterianism. Now, as the low-church-men, though more moderate in their sentiments, look upon the hierarchy as an essential point, it is not surprizing that the tories unite when the growth of *Whigism* is to be opposed, which has all the presbyterians in it's party. It is, perhaps, an artifice of the state-tories to have given, or at least to continue with so much care, the name of tories to the episcopalians, in order to confound in the same party, interests of a different nature, because this confusion is very serviceable to them.

The papists are likewise considered as a branch of the tories, because they always remain attached to that party. As they can never hope to see popery established but by means of an absolute king, it is not strange that they rank themselves with the high-flyers. Indeed, this assistance would not be

very considerable to the tories, if confined to the *English* papists, since enjoying neither places, nor votes in elections, they cannot have much credit. But this admission of papists, engages likewise foreign powers in the tory interest, who can on certain occasions be very serviceable. Nevertheless it cannot be denied, that by this, the tories give their enemies great advantage against them, who use this pretence to render them odious.

If the leaders of the tory party aimed only at maintaining the prerogatives of the king, and the rights of the church, it may be affirmed, that party would be invincible; because that is the true interest of the kingdom. But as it sometimes happens, that these are only pretences to cover other projects, less agreeable to the good of the state; when once their designs are discovered, their friends generally draw off, a division of the tory-members being a necessary consequence of such discovery. This makes me think that it is almost impossible they should ever succeed in setting the pretender on the throne, or investing any king whatsoever with absolute power. This opinion is founded upon it's not being the interest or desire of the nation in general. And hence it is, that they so firmly espouse the interests of *France*, because they are very sensible they want her assistance. It was seen in the last war that the ill successes of that crown were terrible mortifications to them, and therefore they endeavored, as much as possible, to lessen them. Accordingly when they were at the helm, their first care was to cure the wounds, *France* had received. However; it is very difficult for *France* to put them in possession of their wishes. *Great-Britain* is an island which can hardly be attacked unawares; and which, while there is a good understanding between the king and the parliament, can send out fleets which *France* is not in condition to oppose.

The high-flyers are therefore to be considered as a party, to which the junctures of the time are not

at all favorable, and consequently it should be their interest to remain in a state of inaction, till time should produce some opportunity to exert themselves. But to be quiet in no part of their character. They cannot possibly be easy, while they see themselves excluded from all places of honor and profit, which probably are the springs of their motions. It is however certain, that the disturbances raised by them from time to time to very little purpose, are attended with great injury to themselves, as well as to all the tories in general, who are always charged with the faults and passions of those who are looked upon as their leaders. This very consideration induces some to desert their party.

As to the three other branches of the tories, namely, the moderate, the rigid, and the low, it would be folly in the whigs to think of their ruin by violent methods. This could not be effected without overturning the kingdom. They may indeed exclude them from public posts and employments. But if they should be so imprudent as to meddle with the church of *England*, they would ruin the hazard of raising a storm, which might cost them the superiority they at present enjoy. Therefore it is the interest of the whigs to leave the church unmolested, and their conduct shows they are perfectly convinced of this truth. Though they have lately had frequent provocations, it is not seen that now, they are in power, they seek to be revenged on the episcopal party. On the contrary, their grand aim is to divide that party if possible, from the rest of the tories, by convincing them that they bear no ill-will to the church. If they could succeed, their victory over the high-flyers would be certain. But these last, sensible of the prejudice which this conduct does them, endeavor to prevent it's effect by always engaging the church with their quarrel, and inspiring the people with continual fears of the designs of the whigs against the church.

Having shown the views, strength and interest of the tory party, I am next to speak of the four branches of the whigs. As to the republican-whigs, they are at present very inconsiderable, and their party daily diminishes. There is not the least probability of their ever finding again an opportunity like that during the troubles of *Charles I's* reign.

I have already observed that the principal difference between the moderate whigs and tories, is, that the latter are more inclined to the king's prerogatives, and the former to the privileges of the subject. But this prevents not their union when the state is in danger. Were the moderate tories not episcopalians, and had the moderate whigs fewer presbyterians among them, it might be hoped that these two branches, of whigs and tories would remain for ever united, as they seem to be since the death of king *William*. But when I say that the one incline more to the king, and the others to the subject, I speak the truth, and not what they say themselves. The two parties affirm, on the contrary, they have no other aim, than the preservation of the government as established many ages. So to hear them, you would think they form, and always have formed one and the same party. It is however but too true, that their different inclination frequently obliges them to divide though it is to be presumed their intentions, are equally good, and that they differ only in the means they imploy. The one perhaps are too jealous of the increase of the royal prerogative, and the others fear it not enough. But it is religion which chiefly makes them to be considered as different parties, because the one is composed wholly of episcopalians, and the other has a great mixture of presbyterians. Now to separate the interests of the church from those of the state, requires abstractions of which all are not capable. Nevertheless it may be affirmed, that the branch of the moderate whigs considered separately, and

in itself, is not less powerful than that of the moderate tories. But when both join together, they form a party which would be resistless, if religion were out of the question. The great business therefore of the moderate whigs is to assist the people as much as possible, to discern the interests of the church from those of the state; for which purpose they are to treat the episcopalians with great moderation. Nor ought they to be less careful how they listen to the republican-whigs, for fear of alarming the moderate tories, of whom they have frequent occasion. But on the hand, nothing ought to be neglected by them for breaking the measures of the high-flyers, who are their real enemies. Such is the course they must take to preserve their credit.

I proceed now to the church-whigs, who are divided into two branches, of which the first is of the rigid presbyterians, who absolutely reject not only the hierarchy, but moreover every ceremony practised in the church of *England*. Their number is very great in *England*, but they are still more considerable by having all *Scotland* for them. They are continually laboring the propagation of presbyterianism, and on some occasions the leading whigs to content them, are obliged to take some steps prejudicial to the whole party. It is easy to conceive that the interest of the rigid presbyterians requires an innovation in the established religion, because it can only be by some great revolution that their own can come to be uppermost. Wherefore they are considered as dangerous men, and very unfit to head the whig-party, who in all appearance, would be ill conducted by such leaders.

Lastly, There is another branch of church-whigs, which includes the moderate presbyterians, and to which may be added all the rest of the non-conformists, as quakers, anabaptists, &c. who find more support from the whigs than from the tories, though their junction adds no great strength to

the party. The moderate presbyterians, less scrupulous, less passionate, and less obstinate than the rigid, make no difficulty to join the assemblies of the established church, and even to communicate therein when their interest requires it. If it were left to their choice, presbyterianism would be the reigning religion. But they do not think it prudent to labor to make it so by violent methods. They know, it would be an infallible means to unite all the tories against them; whereas it is the interest of all the whigs to keep them divided, by continually insisting upon the distinction between state and church-tories, and showing that they have no ill design against the latter. These are doubtless, the most dangerous enemies of the high-flyers and rigid tories, because by their moderate conduct they deprive them of the pretence to complain that the church is in danger. These were aimed at by the tories in their act, towards the conclusion of queen *Anne's* reign, against occasional conformity. As few are acquainted with the nature of this act, I shall briefly explain it.

In the reign of *Charles I.* an act was made called the *conformity act*, whereby any person admitted to any public office was to bring a certificate of his having received the sacrament in the church of *England*. The intent of this act was to exclude all non-conformists from places of any kind. Indeed, it produced this effect with regard to the rigid presbyterians who could not resolve to receive the communion from the hands of a bishop, or a minister of the episcopal church. But the moderate presbyterians were not so scrupulous. On their admission to any post, they scrupled not to receive the communion in an episcopal church, and to take the proper certificates. It was not possible for the tories to add any explication to this act during the reign of king *James*, who on the contrary, granted an universal liberty of conscience, nor in the lifetime of king *William*, or the first years of queen

Anne. But having the power in their hands at the conclusion of her reign, they were not contented with reviving this act, but added to it a clause to prevent occasional conformity, or the communicating in the church of *England* on account of some employment. This excluded not only the rigid but also the moderate presbyterians from all public offices: For by this act, which is still in force, to communicate once in an episcopal church, is not a sufficient qualification for a place, as before, but a man must show that he is really a member of the church of *England*. If the whigs who at present prevail, dared to meddle with this act, it would soon be repealed. But for reasons before intimated, very probably it will be suffered to subsist, and its violation only connived at.

The strength of the two parties being such as we have seen, and the interest of the several branches so opposite, it seems to me a natural consequence, that the placing a popish prince upon the throne while the king and parliament are in union, and the rights of the church are untouched, is a thing almost impossible. The people may from time to time be deluded by imaginary fears of the church's danger. But this delusion must quickly vanish, when it is seen that the church is not really attacked. Now if religion is not concerned, that is, if the episcopalians do not think themselves under an absolute necessity of trying all ways to save their church from ruin, the endeavors in favor of the pretender, will prove ineffectual. As often as it shall be attempted to place him on the throne, the moderate state and church-tories will join the whigs, and then that party will be too strong for the high-flyers, though in matter of religion, they should be joined by all the rigid tories, which however is not very likely. For it must not be imagined, because a few rigid tories make a great noise, that the whole branch wish to see a popish prince on the throne. They are zealous for their church, but their church

is protestant, and this very zeal suffers them not to indanger their religion. It will be said perhaps that *France* will assist the high-flyers with all her forces. This is what I can hardly believe for reasons I shall mention hereafter. But though *France* should heartily ingage in this undertaking, the execution would be difficult on account of the situation and naval power of *England*. Nothing but a surprize can produce the effect desired by the high-flyers, papists, and some rigid tories. However, the attempt lately made, will probably induce the king and parliament to take good precautions against such surprizes for the future.

There is still another everlasting obstacle to the establishment of a popish prince, and that is, the possession of some part of the lands of the monasteries, suppressed by *Henry VIII*, by almost every noted family in *England*. The ancestors of the present possessors either received them in presents from the king, or purchased them at an easy rate. If therefore a popish prince should now mount the throne, there is no doubt but he would try to establish his religion. But should his attempt prove successful, in what danger would these estates be? In all probability the present owners would be dispossessed. Nay, who knows whether they would not be called to account for the profits? It is therefore manifest, that the tories and whigs have an equal interest in the prevention of this danger. If the advocates for a popish prince were to be strictly examined, it would be found, without doubt, either they have no possessions of this kind, or believe they have particular reasons to flatter themselves with an exemption from the general law, or with being made amends some other way.

I am now to give a more distinct idea of the two parties of whigs and tories, by showing their respective characters.

The tories in general are fierce and haughty. The whigs are treated by them with the utmost

contempt, and even with rigor when they have the superiority. As the tory party is composed of episcopals, who properly make the body of the nation, they look upon themselves as the prevailing party, and cannot bear an equality, much less a superiority, in their adversaries. I cannot better compare the behavior of the tories to the whigs, than to that of the *Roman* catholicks to the protestants in countries where the papists have the advantage of number, and the support of the government. It is with regret that the tories allow the presbyterians liberty of conscience. When the power is in their hands they seldom failed to prohibit their assemblies, and to exclude them from public employments by acts of parliament. The last years of queen *Anne* afforded flagrant instances of the haughtiness of this party.

There is still another character which belongs to them. They are exceeding passionate and precipitate in their motions. This often disconcerts all their projects. When they have the reins in their hands they drive with amazing rapidity. Very remarkable proofs of this were seen under *Charles II.* *James II.* and the late queen. Nevertheless it must be confessed that this rapidity is not always the effect of an impetuous passion, but is sometimes founded in policy. As the high-flyers, who are commonly at the head of the party, sometimes project the alteration of the government, they are obliged to embrace, with great haste, the opportunities which offer, because these opportunities are naturally transient. For instance, under *Charles II.* it was necessary to put a speedy stop to the progress of the whigs, for fear the king, who was with some difficulty, and for other interests than his own, engaged in the plot, should alter his mind. Besides, there was no time to lose, because it was well known that the whigs were laboring with all their power to inform the people of the true designs of the court. So again, when *James II.* ascend-

ed the throne, the presumptive heir to the crown was his eldest daughter the princess of *Orange*, who was firmly attached to the protestant religion. Wherefore as the king might die without sons, all his projects would vanish by his death, if his work was not finished during his life. It was necessary therefore to make haste, because the like opportunity would probably never offer again after his death. For the same reason, queen *Anne* being childless when she put the ministry into the hands of the high-flyers, a peace was quickly to be concluded with *France*, and speedy measures taken for securing the crown to the pretender, lest her death should prevent the execution of their projects, as it really happened. It was undoubtedly on this account that a peace was so hastily concluded with *Lewis XIV.* because his assistance was thought necessary to accomplish the work. Probably, if the queen had lived a little longer, the act of succession had been repealed. But this precipitation which seems so necessary to the tories, is, on the other hand, prejudicial to them, inasmuch as it too soon discovers the designs of their leaders, which require a gradual execution. In order to succeed, they must have a long and peaceable reign, a king favorable to their designs, and of great ability, or at least ready to be guided by their counsels.

Another character of the tories is, their change of principles as their party prevails or is humbled. When they have the prince on their side, the doctrine of passive obedience is supported with all their power, and every ordinance of the king is to be obeyed without examination, because then, they would have the whigs suffer themselves to be oppressed without any resistance. But when the government is in the hands of the contrary party, this doctrine lies dormant or is forgotten. Thus, in all the tory-writers, who have transmitted the troubles of the reign of *Charles I.* passive obedience is established as a principle certain and incontest-

able: This is owing to their intention of representing the measures of the parliament for their own defence, and in opposition to the designs of the king, as a horrible rebellion. When the presbyterians were persecuted in *Charles II's* reign, passive-obedience was every where talked of. But it was still much worse under *James II.* I remember to have heard from the pulpit, the consequences of this doctrine carried as far, and perhaps farther than ever they were in *France*, under *Lewis XIV.* Great stress was laid upon a canon of a convocation of the church of *England*, which imported, that armies taken up against the king by the subject, on any pretense whatsoever, is direct rebellion: That whether the subject be upon the offensive or defensive, he is clearly condemned by *St. Paul*, who says, *he shall receive to himself damnation.* But the convocation in which this canon was made, was held under archbishop *Laud*, when *Charles I.* governed in an absolute manner, a little before the beginning of the troubles. But when king *William* was on the throne, the doctrine of passive-obedience was no longer enforced, because that king was considered as no friend to the tories. The case was the same under queen *Anne*, while the ministry was composed of whigs, and moderate tories. But the doctrine revived when that princess delivered herself up to the conduct of the high-flyers. But since king *George* has filled the throne, the high-flyers and rigid tories plainly show, this doctrine is only admitted by them when they have a prince of their party, but is rejected without any scruple when the government is not for them. For this purpose they have a distinction ready between a king *de jure*, and a king *de facto*, and maintain that only the king *de jure* has a title to this obedience, but such is every king who favors them, whether he is upon the throne, or has only pretensions to it.

Let us now speak of the character of the whigs. Those of this party who are rigid presbyterians, are a stubborn and obstinate generation, who perhaps would be as hot and as passionate as the tories were they in possession of power. But as, since the long parliament, the party has never been under their direction, it is not upon them that we are to form the general character of the whigs, whereas that of the tories is to be taken principally from the high-flyers and rigid tories, who are their leaders and directors.

The heads of the whig-party, are much more moderate than the leaders of the tories. Besides, they proceed generally upon fixed principles, from which they never swerve, except when they are obliged to give some satisfaction to the presbyterians to keep them from desponding. Far from desiring, like the tories, to carry things with a high hand, they advance gradually, without heat or violence. Their greatest trouble is to curb the passion of some among them, who, were they unrestrained, would quickly ruin the party. By this moderation, they try to insinuate mildly into the people, that they have no ill designs against the church of *England*, in order to separate the church-tories from the high-flyers. As it is the interest of the tories to confound all the branches of their party, and unite them into one body, to be directed by the leaders; so it is the business of the whigs to have these several branches distinguished, that the episcopalians may be prevented from promoting the designs of the high-flyers. But they would never be able to gain this point were they to use violence. Thus the gentleness and moderation of the whigs is no less founded in policy, than the hastiness and precipitation of the tories.

The whigs are charged with being greedy of riches and honors, and ungrateful to their adherents, which makes their friends often forsake them. I can say nothing to this, not being suffici-

ently informed of the particular concerns of the party. Besides, the examination of this charge would lead me to consider the conduct of those who think themselves ill used, which I avoid, as contrary to my intent of confining myself to general ideas. However, it may be said for the moderate whigs, that generally they support a good cause, namely, the constitution of the government as established by law. They err indeed sometimes through too much care and distrust, which throws them now and then upon proceedings contrary to their true interest, and their own principles, since on certain occasions they maintain the privileges of the nation and parliament at the expence of the royal authority.

As to the ecclesiastical whigs, who are no other than the presbyterians, all that can be said of them, is, that they are extremely prejudiced against bishops, and the whole hierarchy. Now the question is, whether this prejudice be well grounded, or being so, whether it affords just cause for separation. For my part, I look upon this dispute between the episcopalians and presbyterians as of little consequence. And therefore I cannot approve of the stiffness of the presbyterians in a country where the reformation is established according to the church of *England*, since the two churches differ in no essential point. I say the same thing of the episcopalians of *Scotland*, and perhaps in *England* itself, greater regard should be had of the scruples of the presbyterians. But this is only my private opinion, which I do not pretend to give for a rule to the one or the other.

Before I proceed, it will be proper to obviate an objection which may naturally occur to the reader, namely, that every thing in *England* being done by way of parliaments, these unions above mentioned, whether of the branches of the same party, or of the branches of the two different parties, seem to no purpose, unless made in the parliament itself between the members. But so far are such unions

from taking place in the parliament, that one of the parties generally so prevails there, as to render the union of the rest of the members intirely fruitless.

To this I answer, first, that the parliament consisting of two houses, whereof that of the lords remains always the same without any considerable change, these unions may take place in that house whose principles are not so variable as those of the commons. Now as the upper house has power to throw out the bills sent up by the lower, it follows that the lords, by means of such unions may break the commons measures, consequently their unions may produce great effects.

Secondly, These unions may influence the elections of members. For instance, on suspicion that a popish prince is intended to be set on the throne, the moderate tories and low-church-men may join with the whigs, and cause such representatives to be chosen as are against what is feared, and thereby break the measures of the high-flyers and rigid tories.

Thirdly, Even in a house of commons, consisting mostly of tory-members, the moderate among them seeing some design in hand prejudicial to the nation, may join with the whigs and hinder the execution of it. The moderate whigs might also unite with the tories, if they saw the republican party growing too strong.

It must however be owned that party-spirit, the cabals of the leading-men, the intrigues of the court, the interest of particular persons, have but too much influence upon the debates of parliament. to say all in a word, the parliament is composed of men who are not free from passions. If the parliament were to answer the idea which those conceive of it, who are not thoroughly acquainted with its nature, it should be composed of perfect men. But as that is impossible, it would be proper, at least, to reform certain abuses, for which hitherto no remedy has been found, or perhaps sought. Though this leads me a little from my subject, I shall stay a

moment and take the liberty to point out some of these abuses. This may at least serve to give a more extensive knowledge of the *English* constitution, which, though excellent in it's nature, is however liable to some imperfections.

The first abuse lies in the two great influence of the court in the election of members. This influence is visibly owing to the division between the whigs and tories, which gives the king an advantage, he would doubtless not have, were all the people well united. When one of the parties gets into the ministry, the lieutenances of the counties and all the court-places are conferred on persons devoted to them. After which a new parliament is called. Then, besides the money privately distributed by the ministry, if report is to be credited, those that are in authority in the towns and counties, use all their interest and skill, to get members chosen favorable to the court, that the ministry may have a superiority of votes in the house of commons. We may judge of the effect of these intrigues by this single consideration, that commonly there is a whig parliament when the ministry is so, and a tory parliament when the ministry are tories. Nevertheless, the thing is not so very certain, but that we find sometimes most of the elections carried against the court, but this rarely happens, unless the nation in general are satisfied that the court has designs pernicious to the state, or the liberties of the subject. I say nothing of our seeing in the late reign twelve peers created at once, with the sole view of procuring the court a majority of votes in the house of lords. This is a palpable as well as a very dangerous abuse.

Another abuse lies in many small boroughs having a right to send representatives to parliament, whose votes have the same weight with those of the members of *London* and *Westminster*, notwithstanding the great disproportion between the electors of the one and the other. In these inconsiderable

boroughs, by the influence of the court, members are chosen that have not a foot of land near the place. It is pretended by some that these boroughs have a right as ancient as the parliament itself, having enjoyed it ever since the time of the *Anglo-Saxons*. Others think it of much later date. But however, it is at present a monstrous abuse, that villages of four or five thatched houses, should be upon the level in parliament with the largest cities of the kingdom.

A third abuse there is of great importance, and which ought to be reformed, since it is in some measure contrary to *magna charta*, on which the *English* found their liberties and privileges. In this charter, king *John* promises to express terms, for himself and successors, to declare beforehand the causes of calling a parliament. As long as this custom was observed, the points debated in parliament were not many, for which the members came prepared, and the sessions lasted but a few days. If this was observed now, the boroughs and counties might give their representatives instructions upon the affairs for which the parliament should be called, or at least, might chuse such members as are of the same sentiments of the electors. But at present, several abuses spring from the non-observance of this method.

- In the first place, the sessions hold as long as the king pleases, and are ended when he thinks proper. *Henry IV.* improved this advantage by keeping the parliament assembled, till the desired subsidy was granted. In the next place, the electors not knowing the business on which the parliament is to proceed, are forced to give their representatives an unlimited power. Hence arises another abuse, that the representatives of a borough or county, are often of a contrary opinion to those that send them. It may therefore happen, nay, it has frequently happened, that the resolves of the lower house are directly opposite to the sentiments of

the people who they represent. So it is not the people or commons of *England* that share the legislative power with the king and peers, but their representatives who enjoy a privilege which belongs only to the people in general, to whom however they are not accountable for their conduct. All they can suffer, in case they have acted contrary to the sense of their borough or county, is not to be chosen another time. This seems therefore, to be lodging too great a power in bare representatives. It was not so in *France*, when the states of that kingdom were convened. Every province drew up, before-hand, their particular instructions, from which their deputies were not allowed to swerve. In like manner, in important affairs to be debated by the states general of the *united provinces*, the deputies receive instructions from their provinces; and in the particular states of each province, the magistrates of the towns give their orders and instructions to their deputies.

A fourth abuse lies in the public canvassings at the time of elections, with great expense. It costs some men several thousands of pounds to be elected, and this openly in the face of all the world.

Lastly, There is another sort of abuse in the house of commons, namely, that the members are allowed to go and come or absent themselves as they please, except on certain great occasions, so that of five hundred and thirteen members, (if I mistake not,) there are not present sometimes above one hundred and fifty. This makes it much more easy for the parties, to cabal, than if the house were full. Moreover many members, though in *London*, do not constantly attend the house, but keep away upon any the slightest affair of their own. This puts me in mind of a pleasant story, with which I shall close this digression. A whig member telling one of the same party in great anger, "That if he had been at the house that morning, they should have carried an important point."

The other calmly asked him, "By how many they lost it? By one single vote," says he. The other replies, "Had I been there, we should have lost it by four, for there would have been four tories more, whom I have kept all this morning on purpose at a tavern."

It remains only that I briefly speak of the interests of the neighbouring states, with regard to the whigs and tories. Though the differences between the two parties seem only to respect *England*, they have a great influence on the affairs of the other states. The peace of *Utrecht* clearly shows of what consequence they are to all *Europe*.

Every one knows that the states-general of the united provinces are friends of the whigs, and very justly, since the whigs have all along supported their interest in *England*. The whigs obliged *Charles II.* to make a peace with *Holland*, when he was in league with *Lewis XIV.* against her. From that time, they have ever considered the interest of the *Dutch* as their own. Accordingly in their turn they have received signal services from them, particularly in the assistance given by the states-general to the prince of *Orange*, to go and break king *James's* measures. This good understanding is still cultivated, so that the *Dutch* may be said to be whigs, and the whigs to be *Dutch*. The reason of this union is evident. For *France*, perpetual enemy of *Holland*, ever supported the tories; whence it follows, that *Holland* is obliged to stand by the whigs, since she cannot expect assistance from *England*, but by their means. This is so clear, that it needs no farther illustration.

For the same reason, the emperor, as sovereign of the *Netherlands* ought to be a friend to the whigs. As he must look upon the king of *France*, as a very formidable and dangerous neighbour, he can expect the assistance of the *English*, in case his dominions are invaded, but when the whigs are in power. In all appearance, the tories would not

exert themselves in the defence of the *Netherlands* against the invasions of *France*. But, should the emperor, through excessive zeal for his religion, lend his forces to the pretender to ascend the throne of *England*, he would render *France* still more powerful, and add to the ballance of *Europe* a weight which would make it entirely incline to one side.

The interests of *France* with regard to the whigs and tories, afford matter for many more observations. In general, it is doubtless the interests of that crown to cultivate a good understanding with *England*. Since the growth of the house of *Austria*, that is, since about two hundred years, *England* has ever had it in her power to incline the ballance either on the side of *Austria* or on the side of *France* as she pleased. But it has been her standing interest to keep the ballance even between these two powers. This has been the hinge on which all the policy of the kings of *England* has turned, for two centuries. *Henry VIII's* varying sometimes from this course is to be ascribed wholly to the private interest of cardinal *Wolfey* his prime minister, or to his own caprice. So it was ever the interest of *France* to keep fair with *England*. Accordingly *Lewis XIV.* has politicly endeavored these fifty years, either to get *England* on his side, or at least, to prevent her from espousing that of his enemies. But as it was not easy for that monarch to persuade the *English* that to incline the ballance to his side was for their advantage, he confined his endeavors to hinder them from concerning themselves in the affairs of *Europe*, to the end he might proceed without any opposition from them. But it must be observed, that this policy respected only his vast designs of enslaving all *Europe*. Otherwise he would have had no need to trouble himself about the *English*. To set this matter in a clearer light, it will not be amiss to show briefly how this monarch managed with regard to *England*.

Lewis XIV, as every one knows, formed the project for an universal monarchy in *Europe*. As he was not ignorant that *England* was concerned to keep the ballance of *Europe* even, and that the *English* considered this maxim as the chief foundation of their security, he was justly apprehensive of their opposing the execution of his designs. For prevention of which, he used all his address to gain *Charles II.* to his interest, when he had resolved upon a war with *Holland* in 1672. The ministry being tory he drew *Charles* by their means, into a league with him. But this league was of no long continuance. It was so evidently against the interest of *England*, that the parliament obliged the king to make peace with *Holland*. Nay, they would have constrained him to declare against *France*, if a prospect of an approaching peace between that crown and the states-general, had not hindered them from going so far.

The peace of *Nimeguen*, concluded in 1678, caused not the king of *France* to discontinue the prosecution of his grand designs. But as he was very sensible king *Charles* would not have it in his power to follow his own inclination, he resolved to take another method, in order to disable *England* at least from interposing in the affairs of *Europe*. And that was to raise troubles in the kingdom, and then to foment them, that the *English* might be employed at home. The duke of *York's* plots, the king his brother's easiness to be guided by his counsels, the choice of passionate and perhaps corrupt ministers, proceeded, in all appearance, from *Lewis's* secret practices in *England*. This method succeeded to his wish. The conspiracy discovered by *Titus Oates*, the pretended protestant-plot, the persecution of the presbyterians, the people's murmurs, the discord between the king and the parliament, found the *English* so much employment at home, that it was not possible for them to look abroad. In the mean time, *Lewis XIV.* was rendering himself form-

idable to all *Europe*, having nothing to fear from the *English* who remained idle, when they should have used their utmost endeavors to put a stop to his progress.

Upon the accession of *James II.* to the throne, *Lewis* gave not over a method that had proved so successful. On the contrary, he pressed the new king of *England* to execute the projects he had formed when duke of *York*, in favor of popery and arbitrary power. He new these two points were sufficient to keep *England* long employed ; however, as his aim was only to embroil the nation, he never assisted king *James* to any purpose. The too sudden execution of the prince's designs was not for his interest. When he saw him on the point of being attacked by the prince of *Orange*, he never stirred in his defence, but rather made use of the juncture to carry war into *Germany*. He imagined that the troubles he had raised in *England* would long disable that kingdom from opposing his ambitious designs. This was the sole end of all his proceedings. Afterwards, when king *William* proclaimed war against him, he sent king *James* into *Ireland* with seven thousand men, an aid too weak to restore him to his throne, but sufficient to make a diversion, and feed the hopes of the mal-contents. Thus is it demonstrable from *Lewis's* whole conduct, that his sole intention was to embroil *England*, and that king *James* was the dupe of his policy. It seems however at first sight, that king *James's* restoration would have been for *Lewis's* advantage. But most assuredly it was against his interest for a king of *England* to be at peace in his dominions. The reason is plain ; as it is the interest of *England* to keep the ballance even in *Europe*, *Lewis*, who had formed vast projects, would have been in danger of being opposed by a king of *England*, who having no distractions at home, might in the end pursue his true interests, or be forced to it by his parliament. And therefore, *Lewis XIV.* has been satisfied to keep *England* embroiled, and for that

purpose, to hold secret correspondence with the leading tories, who at length have discovered themselves in the last years of queen *Anne*.

It seems therefore to be the *French* king's interest to preserve a good understanding with the tories, in order, by their means, to foment the troubles in *England*. This is strictly true, when he forms designs against the rest of *Europe*. But if he aims to live in peace, and stand upon his defence, in case of invasion, nothing can be more for his advantage than to cultivate the king of *England's* friendship, according to the constant maxim of *Lewis's* predecessors, whether the ministry be whig or tory. *France* may now be said to be invincible, as long as *England* declares not against her. But if the king of *England* is provoked, and enters into a new alliance with *Holland* and *Germany*, the last war's experience shows that *France* is very far from being invincible. It may therefore be affirmed, that if the illustrious prince now at the helm of the *French* affairs, intends not to pursue the vast designs of *Lewis XIV.* it is not his interest to cherish the troubles of *England*, which, instead of being for his advantage, may greatly turn to his prejudice. I confess in the indirect assistance given the pretender in *France*, the regent's proceedings seem to destroy the maxim I mean to advance. Time will unfold, perhaps the mystery of this policy. But in the mean while, I cannot forbear thinking that he is misinformed of the true state of the two parties in *England*, and has given too much credit to interested and prejudiced persons. Perhaps, the pretender himself has been deceived in the same manner.

I have but one observation more to make, with which I shall conclude what I have to say concerning the whigs and the tories. In speaking of their several views, interests and characters, I pretend not to include every particular person of either party, but only their leaders and managers, with some of the most active of both sides. Though

the people in general, by inclination, or interest, are either whigs or tories, it does not follow that every single person acts in the views I have ascribed to them. It is certain most suffer themselves to be led without knowing where it is intended to conduct them, or examining the course prescribed them. Consequently they are far from being concerned in the intrigues and cabals of their leaders. Such a one has listed himself a tory, as being attached to the church of *England*, and afterwards, without knowing how, finds himself obliged to maintain the principles of the high-flyers and rigid tories, though contrary to his inclination. There are thousands of good *Englishmen*, without doubt, who grieve to see their country thus rent with divisions, and would gladly embrace all expedients to put a stop to them. But it is not easy to observe a just neutrality, because it is difficult to be without ambition and avarice. Those who stand neuter, as I said, are neither preferred nor trusted, by reason that one of the parties are always in power, and have nothing more at heart than the advancing their friends, or gaining some of their adversaries. Consequently there can be no posts or offices for men, from whom the prevailing party can expect no manner of service. Moreover, how can a man be neuter between two parties, each of whom represent their adversaries as designing those evils which are most apt to fill men with fears, I mean, the destruction of the religion they profess, and the dissolution of a government, which alone, in their opinion, can render subjects happy? A man must be very insensible not to be moved, with such dangers, when convinced of their reality.

All *Englishmen* therefore are not to bear the blame of these unnatural divisions, but only those who cherish them for their own private interest. Who are they that would invest the king with absolute power? Who are they that would debar free-born subjects of liberty of conscience? Who are they,

in a word, that labor to introduce popery? Can it be said that these are the views of every particular tory? No, by no means. But they are the aims of the leaders, who, for their own ends, seduce the poor people, and make no scruple to involve them in the danger of a civil war.

It may be affirmed, that it is not the kingdom's interest for one of the parties to become so superior as to meet with no opposition. Should it be the high-flyers, they would introduce arbitrary power. And if it were the moderate tories, their bias to the prerogative of the crown, would at length enable the sovereign to shake off the galling yoke of parliaments. Were it possible for the papists to be superior, *England* would soon lose her religion and liberty. On the other hand, if the republican-whigs should recover the advantage they have lost, you would hear no more of the kingdom but the commonwealth of *England*, as in *Cromwell's* days. Lastly, were the moderate whigs to have the management, they would so guard against the incroachments of the regal power, that the sovereign would be reduced to the condition of a doge of *Venice*.

As for the two parties with regard to religion, it is certain, if the presbyterians can ever act without controul, they will not be satisfied till the hierarchy of the church of *England* be entirely demolished. But then, if the rigid episcopalians have nothing to ballance their power, the presbyterians must expect to be openly persecuted. And who knows whether they will suffer them to enjoy a bare liberty of conscience?

Affuredly the welfare of the kingdom consists not in any of the ends proposed by the leaders of both parties. The only way to restore peace and tranquillity, would be to leave the government upon its ancient foot, and the church, as established at the reformation. It would also be necessary to grant a toleration to the presbyterians who are very numerous in the kingdom. If this way be

not used, it will always be better for the state that the people remain in division, than if one of the parties should require a superiority, which would be more fatal to the public than the equality which cherishes discord. I do not see what can put an end to this sort of civil war, but the prudence of a just and equitable sovereign, moderate in his desires and passions, a lover of the protestant religion, and that makes the good and happiness of his subjects his sole care and study. This is what may with reason be expected from the king who now fills the throne, since he possesses all those virtues in an eminent degree. May heaven prosper his designs, and may he live to see the happy effects of his pains and endeavors !

E N D.



Just Published, and to be Sold at
GREENLEAF'S Printing-Office, in Hanover
Street, B O S T O N.

AN abridgment of *Burn's* justice of the peace, and parish officer. To which is added, an appendix, containing some general rules and directions, necessary to be known and observed by all justices of the peace.

Subscribers for said book are desired to call or send for them.

6 AP 64

N. B. This abridgment includes all that is applicable to the practice here, and may be had for nine shillings stitched, and eleven shillings bound. The *London* edition of this book cannot be had under six dollars. Also to be sold at said office, The following pamphlets, viz.

A dissent from the church of *England* fully justified, being the dissenting gentleman's three letters to *Mr. White*.

A calm answer to the question, Why are you a dissenter from the church of *England*?

The case of the dissenting ministers; by *Mr. Mauduit*.
England's warning piece; a sermon occasioned by the murder of *Mr. William Allen*, by a party of soldiers in *George's Fields*.

An anniversary sermon, being a sequel to the above.

The adulateur; a tragedy. By a lady.

Two sermons, occasioned by the condemnation and execution of *Levi Ames*. By the *Rev. Samuel Stillman*.

An oration on the beauties of liberty.

Almanack's for 1774. With a number of other pamphlets, testaments, psalters, spelling books, psalm books, primers, writing paper, ink pots and other stationery; also blanks of various sorts, some never before printed, particularly for the use of justices of the peace.

The practice of churches in *New-England* relating to baptism, vindicated. By *J. Cotton*, A. M. of *Plymouth*. A reply to the same by *Rev. Mr. Robbins*, of *Plymouth*. ALSO, subscriptions are taken in, for an answer to the reply of *Mr. Robbins's*, by *Mr. Cotton*, at said office, where the printing business is carried on with great care and dexterity.

